

MEETING NOTES

Date of Meeting: August 5, 2004
Project: NEEDS ASSESMENT COMMITTEE
Location of Meeting: Shelby County Building, 8th floor Conference Room

PARTICIPANTS:

cc:	Mr. Cato Johnson	Ms. Patrice J. Robinson
	Mr. Jay Weatherington	Mr. Nick Clark
	Mr. Aubrey J. Howard	Mr. Scott Fleming
	Ms. Maura Sullivan	Mrs. Nisha Powers
	Mr. Richard Holden	Mr. Tom Marshall
	Dr. Tom Glass	Mr. Jimmie Tucker
	Commissioner David Lillard	Mrs. Louise Mercuro
	Commissioner Deidre Malone	Mr. Richard Copeland
	Mr. John Fowlkes	

ITEMS DISCUSSED:

1. The meeting was called to order by the Chairman of the committee, Mr. Scott Fleming, who distributed the agenda for the meeting.
2. Mr. Fleming asked if there was any old business that needed to be addressed. No old business was brought to the table.
3. Mr. Fleming brought forth a request from Commissioner Loeffel, which was distributed to all, and suggested that he would like to wait until it was determined what the Committee wanted to do before responding. It was agreed that a response would be issued in the future.
4. Mr. Fleming acknowledged two sub-committees, Development Guidelines Subcommittee and Land Acquisition Subcommittee, and introduced Mr. Nick Clark for an update on the progress of the Development Guidelines Committee.

Meeting Notes
NEEDS ASSESMENT COMMITTEE
August 5, 2004
Page 2

5. Mr. Clark stated that no subcommittee meeting had been held to date. He stated that the objective of this subcommittee was to establish the protocol for evaluating new construction and renovation expenditures and establishing facility guidelines.
6. Mr. Clark then introduced Dr. Tom Glass who gave a presentation on the "Comprehensive Facility Planning Process". Dr. Glass passed out a hand out which outlined his presentation.
7. Mrs. Patrice Robinson stated that since all school construction has state issued guidelines, there is no reason to reinvent the wheel. She stated that the issue is not to get a smaller or cheaper school, but to help students achieve.
8. Mr. Aubrey Howard asked about the economic impact of closing schools within certain districts. Dr. Glass stated that there is an economic impact whenever a school is closed and that this impact should be taken into consideration along with the quality education impact. There should be provisions made for "Community Schools". Community Schools are those inner city schools which are full-service schools, meaning they provide all of the community services such as nutrition, health services, etc. He stated that there should be no standard stamp, but that every project should be unique. A new school building should be built to fit the program. Consideration should be given to what percentage of students attended neighborhood schools.
9. Mr. Clark agreed that the committee's analysis should include an economic impact study to determine impact on the neighborhood. He and Mr. Fleming thanked Dr. Glass for his presentation.
10. Mr. Fleming then introduced Mr. Cato Johnson and the Land Acquisition Committee.
11. Mr. Johnson stated that his committee met last Thursday, July 29, 2004. Attendees included Mr. Richard Copeland, Mr. Tom Marshall, Ms. Deidre Malone, Ms. Wanda Martin and Richard Holden. It was concluded that there is a tremendous lack of long range strategic planning. There should be more coordination between OPD and the schools and that best practices from other counties should be researched (Ex. Florida has impact fees).
12. Mr. Johnson stated that it was determined that the City has excess land and therefore acquisition of land is not required, whereas the County does not. In summary, Mr. Johnson stated that long range strategic planning and forecasting was critical to our process.
13. Mr. Rick Copeland and Ms. Louise Mercuro were introduced for the next presentation.

14. Ms. Mercuro distributed a hand out relating to school capacity for both city and county schools that also showed enrollment trends. She stated that this report was based on last year's enrollment figures and that it could be modified to reflect this years enrollment figures once registration was complete and school was in session.
15. The question was raised whether the average square foot per student should be the same for both city and county schools. Tom Marshall stated that capacity analysis was calculated differently for city and county schools. It was advised by Dr. Glass that the demographics should also be considered, such as the growth of the Hispanic Community which seems to be on the rise. The school systems need to consider square footage based on the types of students and their needs.
16. Mr. John Fowlkes asked is we could find out more information about the movement of population. Mr. Clark asked if OPD can produce projections for population trends over the next five years. Ms. Mercuro indicated that this could be done.
17. Mr. Howard asked that the report include the impacts of annexation and Ms. Robinson asked that the report include optional schools so that they can also be accounted for.
18. Mr. Marshall asked if any data was available on subdivision in/out migration by neighborhoods. Ms. Mercuro stated that this can be done by school zones. Dr. Glass indicated that every child should be given an identification number so that we can follow migration patterns.
19. Commissioner Lillard noted that since the suburban reserve areas will become part of the City in 10 years, uniformity is critical.
20. Dr. Glass asked what the inflation in construction costs are per year. Mr. Fleming stated that his experience has shown about 4-5%. Dr. Glass stated that as we move in years, every request increases significantly due to inflation.
21. Commissioner Lillard stated that it is not this committee's role to dictate how schools are constructed, but to evaluate need for funding. He suggested that we need to develop a cost per square foot per student.
22. Mr. Fleming stated that we already have that number and that we do not want to simply rubber stamp a request. Mr. Clark agreed and stated that we need to provide a criteria, with documentation and reasoning for that criteria.
23. Mr. Marshall indicated that the City's design manual will be completed in six weeks.

Meeting Notes
NEEDS ASSESMENT COMMITTEE
August 5, 2004
Page 4

24. Mr. Holden reminded the committee that a request for funding has already been submitted to the County Commission and that there are immediate needs that must be addressed.
25. Mr. Clark asked that someone explain the CIP approval process to our committee.
26. It was then stated that the Capital Improvement Project funds have not been finalized by Commission and that it could possibly be considered for this year. Land acquisition could slow up progress on the new schools project because of the lack of land availability.
27. Mr. Fleming asked for an estimated time line needed to complete a new school project and it was responded that once the land is acquired it could take as much as eighteen to twenty-four months for construction.
28. Commissioner Lillard stated that the bond issue for the new schools could be addressed in the near future. Commissioner Malone agreed.
29. The Committee came to a consensus that a time line for the completion of the guidelines to be established needed to be made. The self-imposed time line agreed upon by all was 90 days.
30. The guidelines that the committee is to develop include:
 - a. Life safety codes
 - b. Retrofit
 - c. Remodeling
 - d. New construction
 - e. Maintenance
31. It was agreed that the committee needs to focus on the minimum standards to start with and the goal for completion is mid-November to the first of December.
32. Mr. Fleming requested a motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting. Some of the committee members stated that they needed more time to review the minutes, therefore the approval of the minutes of the July 1, 2004 meeting was deferred until the next meeting.
33. Mr. Fleming then proceeded to set a date, time and place for the next meeting. It was suggested that some of the meetings be held at city and county schools and all agreed. The next meeting is set for September 2, 2004 at Locke Elementary School.

34. Mr. Clark initiated discussion on the setting of the Development Guidelines subcommittee meeting. This meeting is set for Wednesday, August 18, 2004 at the Shelby County Board of Education on Avery at 3:00 P.M.
35. Mr. Johnson deferred setting his subcommittee meeting and announced that he would email his members and set a meeting up later in the day.
36. Mr. Fleming thanked Dr. Glass, Louise Mercuro and Richard Copeland for their presentations and adjourned the meeting until September 2, 2004 at 8:00 A.M.

These notes represent my understanding of items discussed and conclusions reached. Participants are requested to review these items and advise of necessary corrections and revisions.

Signed: _____ **Date:** August 29, 2004
Nisha Powers